/ DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 809 CS 508 321

AUTHOR Johnson, Keith F.
TITLE Team Peer Evaluations: A Student-Generated Quantitative Measurement of Group Membership Performance.
PUB DATE Aug 93
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (76th, Kansas City, MO, August 11-14, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advertising; College Students; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Group Dynamics; Higher Education; *Peer Evaluation; Student Developed Materials; *Student Evaluation; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS Advertising Education

ABSTRACT

Students in an advertising research course at a large southern university were assigned to teams for a semester project and developed an instrument to evaluate their peers in the group. Students identified approximately 30 characteristics of working as a member of a team and later honed down the list to 14 individual characteristics. An overall assessment and an open-ended area for positive or negative comments were included in the instrument. Criteria developed by the students include: (1) attendance at group meetings; (2) devotes time to the project; (3) does quality work; (4) communicates with the team; (5) is a team player; (6) and shows initiative. The evaluation instrument was designed by the instructor to stress confidentiality and ease of administration. Since the first use of the instrument, five executions over three semesters have been used (in advertising research and advertising campaign courses). The instructor computes a numerical score for the evaluations, using one of a number of distribution-of-points systems. To allow an instructor to investigate a team member receiving a poor evaluation, team members supply their social security number on the instrument. While the evaluation system takes some instructor time to prepare the instrument and compute the points, it also recognizes that the student can be in a better position than the instructor to evaluate each team member's performance. (Three tables are included--forms for listing individual characteristics of contributions, for presenting the overall assessment measures, and for presenting a sample computation of peer points. A sample instrument is also included.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 809

CONFIDENTIAL

Team Peer Evaluations: A Student-Generated Quantitative Measurement of Group Membership Performance

TEACHING STANDARDS SESSION
PRACTICE AND METHODOLOGY
(ADVERTISING DIVISION)
1993 CONVENTION
ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION IN JOURNALISM
AND MASS COMMUNICATION
AUGUST 11-14, 1993
KANSAS CITY, MO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Keith F. Johnson, Assistant Professor
(Ph.D., University of Georgia)
MANSHIP SCHOOL OF MASS COMMUNICATION
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803
Office: [504] 388-2095 • FAX [504] 388-2125

CONFIDENTIAL

CS508321

ABSTRACT

Having students work in competitive teams is a popular teaching technique, especially in advertising campaign courses. To ensure all members of a team contribute fully, peer evaluations are suggested to assess in-group performance. A team-assignment class identified the salient aspects of team membership and the aspect's importance in evaluating team members' contributions. Likert statements are used to arrive at a quantitative assessment of peer performance. The student-generated instrument has been validated by students and is a helpful evaluative tool.

INTRODUCTION

Assigning individual students to competitive teams is a commonly accepted teaching tool. It gives the student the chance to experience the group dynamic as well as demonstrate knowledge learned in a course or courses. Many of today's advertising faculty experienced at least one team situation in their academic pursuits. Horrific stories, as well as fond memories and lasting friendships, often originate from such group assignments.

In advertising, it is well established that no individual carries the total effort in building an entire advertising campaign. Research, media, creative — all areas frequently reflect the departmentalized advertising agency. An examination of various syllabi for campaigns and other advertising courses shows that team situations are frequently used (holdings of various syllabi are collected by organizations such as the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication's Advertising Division [AEJMC] or the American Academy of Advertising [AAA]). Such team assignments give the individual student a chance to excel in one area, assist in another, and in the process learn valuable lessons on how to work with colleagues toward a mutual objective. It is fascinating to watch shy and reticent students zoom to monolithic qualities of managerial talent while, just as frequently, the shining star student can turn out to have contributed nothing at all to the final product — and, in some cases, acts to the detriment of the group as a whole.

Most universities have established rules concerning the assignment of student grades in which mastery of the specified content of the course is a major criterion. However, in team situations, the instructor frequently is not in a position to make such a subjective, qualitative judgment. Teams meet out of class to organize, rehearse, "think tank," and otherwise experience the group effort.

The objective of a group or team effort usually culminates in a group grade for the final product — an advertising campaign in book and/or presentation form, a research report, etc. That grade is assigned to all students in the group and usually contributes significantly to the final course grade for the student, often in concert with additional individual grades. The percentage of the final grade allocated to the team project varies according to individual instructors.

To ensure that all students do their fair share, and are appropriately evaluated, many team-teaching approaches establish a percentage of the final course grade as a peer evaluation in which all members of a group evaluate the relative contribution of all team members, including themselves. The student thus becomes the surrogate instructor, providing confidential evaluations for the instructor's consideration. As with many statistical approaches, one finds that student evaluations per individual are rather constant; those who make contributions are so credited and those who take advantage of the group situation or ignore their responsibilities are downgraded by their peers — often more harshly than they would have been by the instructor. This gives the instructor insight as to how the group worked as a unit as well as who is deserving of individual recognition.

Obviously, a grading scheme is needed which is fair and equitable to the student, and, perhaps even more importantly, one which is defensible should such a subjective grade be appealed to a faculty committee.

The purpose of this paper is to describe how a student-generated measurement instrument was created and, over several executions, validated by the students themselves.

METHOD

Twenty students in a Fall 1990 advertising research course at a large southern university were assigned to teams for a semester project. It was noted on the course syllabus that the class would complete team projects in addition to other graded items and that a percentage of the grade for the course was based on a peer evaluation from team members. When students inquired about the basis for the evaluation, the instructor reversed the question back

to the students: "What do you think is important? What should be evaluated?"

In fact, the exercise was a ruse to get the class into a focus-group-type discussion and, later, it was pointed out that what had transpired was, in fact, a form of focus group used in a qualitative manner to arrive at a quantitative instrument.

(It is important to note that the instrument created by this focus-group technique was a *student-generated instrument*. While management studies may identify other aspects of group dynamics, and psychometric theory may call for differing approaches, this instrument was generated *by* students *for* students who would actually participate in the team projects. It was the intention of the instructor to add to the instrument additional characteristics of group obligations if needed, but the student-generated aspects proved to be sufficiently encompassing that additional characteristics were unnecessary.)

The first instrument which was devised represented important aspects of team member performance as identified by students and was used twice in the same academic term. First, a mid-term peer evaluation was executed which would not apply to the course grade but serve as a means by which students could learn how their contributions were being perceived — and with which they could adjust their behavior accordingly prior to the final end-of-course evaluation. Next, the instrument was administered at the end of the course and the scores were considered in the computation of individual course grades.

Salient Characteristics of Team Membership

The students first identified approximately 30 characteristics of working as a member of a team. Some were overlapping or repetitious operationalizations, while others were found to inherently measure more than a single characteristic (much the way socio-economic status measurements lead to an understanding of both education and income). The initial list was honed down to 14 individual characteristics in a verbal quasi-factor analysis. Students felt these characteristics needed to be measured on an interval scale to capture the magnitude of an individual's contribution to the final product. Thus, Likert levels of interval measurement were added to the 14 characteristics (see Table 1), anchored by "5," Strongly Agree, to "1," Strongly Disagree.

In addition, students felt that several overall measures should be applied to take into account a student's personal circumstances as well as performance as a whole — characteristics not on the individual itemized list. A major contribution at a crucial moment, students argued, could offset deficiencies in other areas, whereas a student should receive recognition for undertaking typing and other aspects of production of the final product although their contributions in other areas may have been substandard during the team's work. Additionally, students indicated a willingness to make adjustments in a team's demands for special circumstances outside the academic realm (such as parenting, upcoming marriage, employment, etc.). An overall measure, they said, would allow positive evaluations as a whole to offset negatives arrived at from assessment of individual criterion items. Such a measurement would also be used to measure the intangibles of the team dynamic. A letter grade, as well as a distribution of an established number of points between team members, was arrived at as a means of measuring an individual's contributions above and beyond the individual characteristics listed. These two overall assessment measures are shown in Table 2.

Finally, students also said that a qualitative section, via an open-ended area for positive or negative comments, should be included so areas not identified in the itemized section could be given significance. Students noted that every project is unique and different in scope and may have criteria which may not be on the itemized list. Such a section would allow for the idiosyncrasies of each individual team assignment.

A short discussion of the itemized, overall and open-ended questions follows.

<u>Itemized Criteria</u>

• *Attendance at group meetings.* Students identified attendance at group meetings as the number-one problem of working in a group. Not only are absent team members unavailable to contribute to the group effort, they cannot provide input on other member's suggestions, vote on group decisions, etc. Students further identified that it was unfair for one student to be given credit for the group's work via a group-wide grade when the student did nothing to aid in the group's effort. A common complaint was that every student is busy with courses, jobs, and other outside interests; if one could make the time for the meeting, students said, so should all group members.

• *Devotes time to the project.* It was also noted that finding a time period in which all team members are available for a meeting is increasingly difficult given the varied number of obligations students face with classes, work schedules, and other outside interests (fraternity/sorority and other organization obligations, internships, etc). The class decided that time spent *outside* the group meeting could be as valuable to the group effort as time spent in meetings — and, in fact, could be more valuable if a student simply attended the meetings and did nothing else.

Therefore, time devoted to the project became an additional criterion.

It was recognized that much of a team's work was done outside of group meetings — hours conducting secondary research in a resource center, pouring over Standard Rate and Data entries, or working in a computer center. Therefore, actual time spent working on behalf of the group's final product was felt to be a valid criterion of measuring an individual team member's performance.

• *Takes the project seriously.* Many students noted that frequently a student will "blow off" the assignment, giving it only half-hearted effort, and are willing to accept a lower, passing grade without doing the necessary effort to achieve a higher grade or produce higher-quality work. It was also noted that a substandard effort was frequently the case when a non-major was in the group — either due to disinterest or lack of skills to accomplish the task. Therefore, the importance with which each member addressed the group's objective was allocated a Likert statement.

• *Meets group deadlines.* Once a schedule for a group's work has been set, a member's not meeting a deadline tends to throw the entire group off schedule. Reflective of the industry the advertising student will enter, the importance of meeting deadlines was strongly stressed by students. They also underscored the importance of the sequential, almost linear nature of advertising work (media buys cannot go forward without the primary research, which should not advance without the secondary research, etc.). Therefore, meeting the group's deadlines was considered a critical part of a team member's responsibility.

• *Does quality work.* Simply turning in an assignment to the group and thus meeting a deadline obligation was deemed insufficient if students had to return the job to the team member for reworking or, worse, had to take on the additional obligation of correcting the work. As was the case with attendance, meeting an assignment deadline with useful, quality work was deemed an important criterion of group work when a team depends upon the material for the final product to be completed.

• *Is dependable.* Students said that while meeting deadlines with quality work is necessary, team members must be dependable in other areas as well. One example: A student once promised to bring an extension cord on the day of presentation and did not. The entire presentation room had to be redesigned, furniture relocated, etc., so that the presentation equipment could be placed near an electrical outlet. Students provided other examples, indicating that dependability of responsibilities and individual assignments was an important criterion of team membership.

• *Follow through on assignments.* Students noted that meeting deadlines does not necessarily end a task; adding additional material, merging works of other team members, and in general giving extra effort ("going the extra mile") to see to it that one's task was accomplished fully and in line with the larger group task was deemed important enough to be given a separate, itemized Likert statement.

• *Communicates with team.* Students perceived team members as irresponsible if they missed meetings and didn't tell the team why; or, in its simplest form, neglected to communicate with the team members. The students said each member of a team should always have a general idea of what other team members were doing. This can occur only if team members were communicating with each other.

• *Cooperates with team.* Cooperation is the group dynamic concept at its strongest. Students rated as a highly favorable quality the ability to work in the group, putting the group effort ahead of one's own interest, taking on obligations one doesn't necessarily want but doing so at the team's insistence. Students indicated that it does take a concentrated effort to get along with colleagues and put the team's product as the primary objective.

• *Is a team player.* Students said there was no room for *prima donnas* in a team effort. Once a decision was made, all team members needed to put aside personal preferences and work for the benefit of the team. Students commented that a member's insistence on doing everything or directing everything, not accepting a team's decision and continually wanting to review previous decisions, and/or complaining until getting one's way, only stymied a team's forward movement.

• *Generates ideas.* Students said they had been in groups where reticent team members simply sat through all the discussions and never contributed during important decisions or mental blocks. Any idea is valuable, students said, when no ideas are available. Students indicated that while *quality* of ideas is important, there must first be a *quantity* of ideas from which to choose. Contributing ideas to the project was deemed to be a responsibility of being a team member and became an itemized criterion.

• *Shows initiative.* Volunteering to take on special tasks, act in leadership positions, or lead sections of the team's work was seen by students as taking the initiative on behalf of the group's final product. Such a willingness to voluntarily take on such work was viewed as an important part of a member's responsibilities to the group.

• *Contributes to the learning experience.* Students noted that working in a team situation for a college class should be a positive learning experience. Any group member who minimally contributed to the work or produced work of questionable quality reduced the educational value of the assignment. While the final group product is important, students indicated that getting to that final product should also be part of a quality educational experience.

CONFIDENTIAL

[COURSE CODE & #]
[COURSE TITLE]
[SEMESTER / YEAR]

Final Peer Evaluation

Team: **A**

CONFIDENTIAL

Final Peer Evaluation -- Team A

Fill in the requested information for each team member, including yourself. In the spot indicated, write in your last four SSAN. This will not be matched to your name unless a special circumstance warrants.

Indicate the degree to which each team member reflects the stated concepts, using a Likert-type scale and entering [5] if you Strongly Agree the individual meets the concept, or [1] if you Strongly Disagree (i.e., the individual does NOT meet the concept).

Strongly Agree [5]	Agree [4]	Neither [3]	Disagree [2]	Strongly Disagree [1]

	Name1	Name2	Name3	Name4
1. Devotes time to project.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2. Takes project seriously.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3. Attends group meetings.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4. Does quality work.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
5. Communicates with group.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
6. Cooperates with group.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
7. Meets group deadlines.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
8. Is dependable.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
9. Generates ideas.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
10. Shows initiative.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
11. Is a team player.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
12. Contributes to learning experience.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
13. Brings integrity to the project.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
14. Follow through on assignments.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
15. At this point, relative to the project, which of the following grades would assign this individual: A B C D F? (No ± or -)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

16. Distribute a total of 100 points among your team members. The total of the points added together must equal 100. Use whole numbers only. ____ + ____ + ____ + ____ = 100

17. Complete the comments section on the facing page. Supply information which you feel either calls attention to, is a mitigating circumstance, or is otherwise necessary to understanding the ratings you have supplied above.

18. Fill in your last four SSAN: [ ][ ][ ][ ]

This Final Peer Evaluation is due no later than 12:00 p.m. (Noon), [Day, Date].
You may turn it in to [Faculty Name's] Department mailbox on the second floor.

NOTE: Failure to turn in your Final Peer Evaluation by deadline will result in a loss of all your peer points on your final grade.

Final Peer Evaluation -- Team A
Open Comments Section

Write in any comments you feel are important in your evaluation of all team members, *including yourself*. You may enclose additional sheets of information about any team member if you desire.

Name 1:

Name 2:

Name 3:

Name 4:

[Please add any additional comments you feel are pertinent; please include an evaluation of this form.]

CONFIDENTIAL

(FOLD, STAPLE, AND RETURN TO [FACULTY MEMBER])

[Faculty Name]
[Department Address]
[University]

CONFIDENTIAL

A

• *Brings integrity to the project.* Instructors often can see that material seemingly generated by a group may, in fact, come from another source. Students openly said they know when this happens — in fact, they often discussed whether to credit sources, falsify data, etc. Ethics and professionalism were noted by students as being important considerations of team membership. Students also noted that the final group product is frequently shown to potential employers and should reflect a professional and ethical piece of work.

Overall Measures

• *Letter grade assignment.* Students said that since the final product of the group's performance was to be assigned a grade, each member of a team should likewise assign a grade to each member's performance. Students decided that the standard "A" to "F" grade scale was an appropriate measure.

• *Distribution of points.* An allocation of points to each team member, with the total of all team members' points adding up to a set sum ("Divide 100 points among your team members"), was also seen as a way to recognize those who had done more than their "fair share." Such a measurement was added to the evaluation schema.

Qualitative Open-End Assessment

As noted before, students felt that outside influences (such as internships, parenting, or jobs) may limit a team member's ability to contribute to the project. An open-ended space in which team members could add written comments was felt to be necessary to allow members to express any qualified commentary.

THE FINAL INSTRUMENT

The evaluation instrument (see attached example), was designed by the instructor to stress confidentiality and yet be easy for the instructor to administer. The peer evaluation is printed on 11"x17" paper, folded to form a booklet, with appropriate graphics added.

The cover indicates the course number and team assignment, with "Confidential" in reverse type at the top and bottom of the page. Inside, the first page contains instructions and the itemized Likert statements and the second page allocates space for open-ended commentary. The back cover replicates the front cover, with instructions on folding and sealing the document for security, and instructions on how to turn in the document to the instructor. (In the original focus group, students also indicated that a student who fails to provide a team peer evaluation should be penalized; students recommended that team members should lose all their potential peer evaluation points if their evaluation was not turned in by the specified deadline. Language to this effect was added in later versions of the form.)

PRETEST, EXECUTION AND INSTRUCTOR USAGE

The first semester of the instrument's use was considered a two-execution pretest, as previously noted. Changes made following the pretests included clearer instructions; the awkwardness of letter-grade assignments with plus or minus was removed by limiting letter assignments to "A," "B", "C", "D," or "F;" and the distribution-of-points section was limited to whole numbers for ease of computation, with copy altered to indicate the equation of adding the points for a specified total (i.e., "00+00+...=000 points"). For the open-ended section, team members' names were added and each was allocated a designated space to encourage commentary.

Since the first use of this document, five executions over three semesters have been used (in advertising research and advertising campaign courses). In these later applications, the forms were altered to include copy that asked students to suggest additions and revisions to the instrument. Students have indicated the form was an adequate evaluation measure and suggested no additional criteria. A few students have indicated that open-ended commentary seemed superfluous given the itemized criteria; however, in later executions, students have been using the open-ended sections to discuss situations for which the section was originally designed.

Computation of Evaluation

For the instructor, computation is most easily done on a percentage basis (see example, Table 3). Each student has a set number of total earned peer points possible (X points possible times the number of members in a team). Team members evaluate the entire team, including their own contributions. For one student's evaluation of another, the 14 Likert statements, at a maximum of five points ("Strongly Agree") to one point ("Strongly Disagree") each, total 70 points; letter-grade assignment is executed as "A=5" to "F=0;" this brings one individual team member's point possibility by another team member to 75.

For the distribution-of-points, a total of 100 possible points was selected for ease of the student in distributing

points across all team members. Obviously, the per-member point potential varies given the number of students in the team. For example, a team of four students, dividing 100 points, could result in each member's "fair share" point possibility being 25.

Thus, for this example of a four-member team, each member would have a total of 100 *possible* points times the number of members in a team (or 400 points possible); the percentage of points earned out of 400 is applied to the total number of *course* points allocated to the peer evaluation. For teams of more than four, the percentage of each team member's total points earned out of the total points possible is multiplied against the total number of course points allocated to the peer evaluation.

The distribution-of-points system makes it possible for an individual to exceed a 100 percent evaluation from their colleagues; this makes intuitive sense, as those who score high on all other areas could score higher than "fair share" on a distribution-of-points. Should an individual end up with more than 100 percent of the points possible from all evaluations (such as 424 points out of 400; 106 percent), it is up to the instructor whether or not to award bonus points above the amount which count toward the final grade.

Another distribution-of-points approach is to establish that each member can be awarded up to 100 points by each other member; that is, 100 points is not distributed among team members but each member can earn up to 100 points. However many points possible this may total (4 members = 400 points possible on distribution-of-points measure) is simply added to the other measures. The percentage of points earned out of points possible is computed the same way; exceeding 100 percent is not possible in this computation.

In cases where a team member may have all but one excellent evaluation, the open-ended section usually provides a clue as to the reason why. Open-ended commentary also validates poor numerical evaluations with information as to what a team member may or may not have done to earn a poor peer evaluation. Since inception of this instrument, the instructor has not found it necessary to overrule a team member's evaluation score — a caveat specified on the course syllabus.

However, to allow an instructor to investigate a team member receiving a poor evaluation, all team members supply their Social Security Account Number (SSAN) on the document, with notice that the number will not be matched to the student evaluator's name unless "extreme circumstances warrant such an identification."

In six executions, this instructor has only had one situation in which such an identification was so warranted. The team's evaluations were reviewed; two of the five evaluations of a team member were rather harsh and at variance with the other three. New copies of the evaluation form were sent to the two students who provided the poor evaluations, asking for their reconsideration. The forms were never returned and the student receiving the poor evaluation did not pursue the issue. (In point of fact, even if the two evaluations had been changed to full potential value, there would have been no change in the final assigned grade. But the student receiving the poor evaluations was satisfied that she had been treated fairly.)

Reporting Results

Students are supplied a result of the numerical criteria, omitting the names of the team members. Open-ended commentary is not supplied as it can indicate the identity of the individual team evaluator.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

Through the use of this instrument, an instructor can be in a better position to evaluate a student's performance in a team situation. Students report that through the use of this instrument, they feel their evaluations are taken seriously by instructor and students alike. This gives students a feeling of responsibility; they know their evaluation counts. Students frequently report that knowing they will be evaluated, and that the evaluation will be taken seriously by the instructor and will be computed in their final grade, stimulates them to better their performance.

Admittedly, execution of this approach takes some instructor time. Work is ongoing to develop an SPSS-X program to calculate the evaluation using scannable "gridded" sheets so that the administration of the peer evaluation can be made easier. Validation studies and psychometric standards will also be used to further ground the instrument.

While this evaluation system takes some instructor time to prepare the instrument and compute the points, it also recognizes that the student can be in a better position than the instructor to evaluate each team member's performance and provides a valid, quantitative evaluation of a student's contribution to a team's final product.

###

Table 1: Individual Characteristics of Contributions

For each of the items listed below, indicate your agreement with how each team member reflects these items by entering a "5" if you Strongly Agree the team member reflects the item, "4" if you Agree the team member reflects the item, "3" if you aren't sure, "2" if you Disagree that the team member reflects the item, and "1" if you Strongly Disagree that the team member reflects the item:

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Aren't Sure	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

	Team Member Last Name	Team Member Last Name	Team Member Last Name	Team Member Last Name
	_____	_____	_____	_____
1. Attends team meetings	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2. Devotes time to project	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3. Takes the project seriously	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4. Meets team deadlines	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
5. Does quality work	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
6. Communicates with team	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
7. Is dependable	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
8. Generates ideas	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
9. Shows initiative	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
10. Cooperates with team	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
11. Is a team player	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
12. Contributes to learning experience	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
13. Brings integrity to the project	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
14. Follows through on assignments	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Table 2: Overall Assessment of Campaign Contribution Measures

	Team Member Last Name	Team Member Last Name	Team Member Last Name	Team Member Last Name
	_____	_____	_____	_____
Which of the followng grades would you assign this individual (no + or -; full letter only: A, B, C, D, F):	_____	_____	_____	_____
Distribute a total of 100 points among your team members. The total of the points added together must equal 100. Use whole numbers only:	_____	_____	_____	_____

Table 3: Example Computation of Peer Points
(Assumes a four-member team)

	Possible Per One Evaluation	Student B's Evaluations By Team Members:[1] A	B	C	D
14 Likert Statements; 5 points maximum each:	70	53[2]	60	65	50
Letter Grade Assignment: Five points ("A") maximum	5	4[3]	4	5	3
Distribution-of-Points: 25 points ("Fair Share")	25	30[4]	20	30	28
Total Number of Points Possible Per Team Member:	100[5]	87	84	100	81
Multiplied by four members:	x 4	Four Member Total:			
Total:	400	352 [of 400]			
Percent:	100.0%	88.0%			
Course syllabi allocates five percent of 1,000 course points (50 points) for peer evaluation	50 points possible	44 points awarded in Peer Evaluation			

Legend:

1: These evaluations of Student B include B's own self-evaluation.

2: Student A awarded Student B six 5s, four 4s, three 2s, and one 1, totaling 53 of 70 possible Likert points.

3: Student A evaluated Student B with a "B" letter grade on a "A=5" to "F=0" scale.

4: Student A awarded Student B 30 points on the distribution-of-points measure; an above "fair share" score, given that 100 points were possible for the four person team and 25 points would be the "fair share" or equitable assignment.

5: Note that this could exceed 100 points if individual team members were to each rate a particular student at above the average possible.

[*NOTE:* If each of the four team members had allocated another 20 points each to Student B on the distribution-of-points measure (or another 80 total points), Student B would have a total of 432 points, or 108 percent. The instructor can award the maximum of 50 points or reward the percentaged earned by awarding 54 points.]